

REMARKS

In response to the above-identified Office Action, Applicant amends the application and seeks reconsideration thereof. Claims 1-53 remain in this application. Claims 1, 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49 have been amended. New claim 53 has been added. Applicant submits no new matter is added by these amendments. Applicant also submits that no new search is required as similar limitations found in amended claims 1, 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49 were found in original claim 6 and other claims as well in the original specification and drawings. No claims have been cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-52 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by *Lesenne et al.* US 2002/0196159 A1. The Applicant respectfully traverses.

To anticipate a claim, the relied upon reference must disclose every element of the rejected claim. Amended claim 1 recites "wherein said one or more encryption keys and/or said encryption key identifier is based at least in part upon a portion of said payload." *Lesenne* does not teach or suggest "wherein said one or more encryption keys and/or said encryption key identifier is based at least in part upon a portion of said payload." *Lesenne* may teach utilizing one key from a library of keys, and random modification of keys. However, *Lesenne* does not teach or suggest one or more encryption keys and/or said encryption key identifier based at least in part upon a portion of said payload.

Therefore, *Lesenne* fails to disclose each and every element of claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Lesenne*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 1 is allowable and respectfully requests it be allowed.

Claims 2-9 either directly or indirectly depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 2-9 are also not anticipated by *Lesenne*, at least for the same reasons as independent claim 1, in addition to their own respective features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-9 are allowable, and respectfully requests they be allowed.

Similarly, amended independent claims 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49 now contain a similar limitation of the encryption key and/or the encryption key identifier being based at least in part upon the payload and/or the data utilized to create the payload. *Lesenne* does not teach or suggest this limitation.

Therefore, *Lesenne* fails to disclose each and every element of claims 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49 are not anticipated by *Lesenne*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claims 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49 are allowable and respectfully requests they be allowed.

Dependant claims 11-13, 15-22, 24-26, 28-35, 37-39, 41-48, and 50-52 either directly or indirectly depend from independent claims 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49. Therefore, Applicant submits claims 11-13, 15-22, 24-26, 28-35, 37-39, 41-48, and 50-52 are also not anticipated by *Lesenne* at least for the same reasons as independent claims 10, 14, 23, 27, 36, 40, and 49, in addition to their own respective features. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 11-13, 15-22, 24-26, 28-35, 37-39, 41-48, and 50-52 are allowable, and respectfully requests they be allowed.

New claim 53 includes the limitation of "at least two of the said one or more packets are encrypted utilizing different ones of said one or more encryption keys." *Lesenne* does not disclose, teach, or suggest this limitation. Again, *Lesenne* may teach utilizing one key from a library of keys, and random modification of keys. However, *Lesenne* does not teach or suggest utilizing different encryption keys for different packets within the same communication.

Therefore, *Lesenne* fails to disclose each and every element of claim 53. Therefore, Applicant submits that claim 53 is not anticipated by *Lesenne*. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits claim 53 is allowable and respectfully requests it be allowed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that claims 1-53 are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If

the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned. Applicants authorize and respectfully request that any fees due be charged to Deposit Account No. 19-2814. This statement does NOT authorize charge of the issue fee.

Dated: July 2, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By John H. Platt
John H. Platt
Reg. No. 47,863

SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.
One Arizona Center
400 East Van Buren
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202
Telephone: (602) 382-6367
Facsimile: (602) 382-6070